

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 24, and 27-51 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In the Supplemental Office Action dated February 19, 2008, claims 1-22 were rejected and claims 24 and 27-51 were allowed. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejection of Double Patenting

In the 1st paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejections claims 1-22 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent 6,781,570 ("Arrigo"). To obviate the basis for this rejection for these claims, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer with this Response. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance in view of the Terminal Disclaimer filed herewith. Further, Applicants respectfully submit claims 24 and 27-51 also are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,
Simone Arrigo et al.

Date: April 17, 2008

By: /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Reg. No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200